

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40- 42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 were pending in this application. In the Office Action dated January 6, 2010, claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40- 42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 were rejected.

Claims 1 and 59 are hereby amended to recite inherent aspects of the invention as originally claimed.

Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are hereby respectfully requested.

Summary of Substance of Interview

Applicant's representative, Dohyun Ahn (Reg. No. 63, 237), conducted a telephonic interview with Supervisory Patent Examiner Ahmad F. Matar and Examiner Antim Shah on April 7, 2010. During the interview, claim 1, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0041545 ("Gainsboro") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0091028 ("Chang") were discussed. No agreement was reached with respect to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on the combination of Gainsboro and Chang.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement including copies of Office Actions from related cases was filed on April 14, 2010. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate consideration of these Office Actions in the next communication to Applicant.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 15, 17-20, 22, 32, 42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gainsboro in view of Chang. This rejection is overcome in view of the amendments.

Independent claim 1, as amended, specifically recites, in part:

a networking device connected via digital data links to call processing gateways at the plurality of prison facilities to collect outgoing Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data packets . . . and to distribute incoming VoIP data packets . . . the plurality of prison facilities located remotely from the call processing system . . .

an unauthorized call activity detection system co-located with the networking device . . . for detecting three-way call activity associated with the calls placed from one or more of the plurality of telephone terminals, the three-way call activity detection not performed at the plurality of the prison facilities; and

a call application management system co-located with the networking device

Claim 1 relates to remote centralization of call processing where the call processing and unauthorized call detection are performed at a centralized call processing system that is remote from a plurality of prison facilities. The networking device in the centralized call processing system is connected via digital links to a plurality of prison facilities. The prison facilities are located remotely from the call processing system. An unauthorized call activity detection system is co-located with the networking device to perform three-way call activity. The three-way call activity detection is not performed at the prison facilities. The three-way call application management system is also co-located with the networking system to process outgoing VoIP data packets and incoming VoIP data packets.

The feature of “a networking device connected via digital data links . . . to collect outgoing Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data packets . . . and to distribute incoming VoIP data packets . . . the plurality of prison facilities located remotely from the call processing system . . . an unauthorized call activity detection system co-located with the networking device . . . the three-way call activity detection not performed at the plurality of

the prison facilities,” as recited in claim 1 is advantageous because, among other reasons, call processing for multiple prison facilities is performed at a centralized location. In this way, the need to provide equipments for implementing various call processing functionalities at each prison facility may be obviated.

Gainsboro fails to disclose this feature. In Gainsboro, facility management unit (FMU) 201 for call processing is installed at each prison facility. See Gainsboro, paragraphs [0034] and [0074]; and FIG. 2. FMU 201 in the facilities selectively connects institutional telephones to one or more outside phone lines. Although Gainsboro also discloses FMU 231 (distinct from FMU 201) at a Central Office, FMU 231 appears to perform only network monitoring and administrative tasks. See Gainsboro, paragraph [0084]. That is, FMU 231 at Central Office does not perform call processing or unauthorized call detection. In Gainsboro, each FMU in each site performs the bulk of the processing, including three-way call detection. Therefore, Gainsboro fails to disclose the feature of “a networking device connected via digital data links . . . to collect outgoing Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data packets . . . and to distribute incoming VoIP data packets . . . the plurality of prison facilities located remotely from the call processing system . . . an unauthorized call activity detection system co-located with the networking device . . . the three-way call activity detection not performed at the plurality of the prison facilities,” as recited in claim 1.

Chang does not remedy the deficient disclosure of Gainsboro. Chang was cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing gateways to collect VoIP data packets associated with calls to multiple facilities. In Chang, each gateway appears to serve a single facility. See Chang [0076]; and FIG. 1. Therefore, Chang also fails to disclose anything about a centralized call processing system located remotely from a plurality of prison

facilities.

Hence, claim 1 and its dependent claims 12, 13, 15, 17-20, 22, 32, 42, 96 and 97 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Gainsboro and Chang.

Independent claim 59 similarly recites “the plurality of prison facilities located remotely from the call processing system . . . the call processing system detecting unauthorized three-way call activity associated with the calls, the plurality of prison facilities not detecting the unauthorized three-way call activity” Therefore, the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are applicable to claim 59 and its dependent claims 62, 63, 71 and 98.

In the Office Action, claims 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gainsboro, Chang and U.S. Patent No. 7,333,798 (“Hodge”). Claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gainsboro, Chang and U.S. Patent No. 6,985,478 (“Pogossiants”). These rejections are overcome in view of the amendments.

Claims 21, 25, 40 and 41 depend from claim 1; and therefore, these claims incorporate the limitations of claim 1. Hodge and Pogossiants were cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing a justice application system and a session initiation protocol (SIP), respectively. Hodge and Pogossiants are not relevant to call processing for a plurality of prison facilities at a remote location. Hence, claims 21, 25, 40 and 41 are also patentable for the same reason as set forth above for claim 1.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,505,406 (“Spadaro”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Spadaro fails to disclose the feature of “a networking device connected via digital

data links . . . to collect outgoing Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data packets . . . and to distribute incoming VoIP data packets . . . the plurality of prison facilities located remotely from the call processing system,” as recited in claim 1.

Specifically, Spadaro does not disclose any networking device for collecting outgoing VoIP data packets or distributing incoming VoIP data packets to a plurality of prison facilities. The administration systems described with reference to FIG. 3 of Spadaro relate to processing and transmitting data such as emails. See Spadaro, col. 3, ll. 65-67. The administrative systems of Spadaro do not relate to processing or routing of VoIP data packets. Embodiments described with reference to FIGS. 4 through 6B are related to providing call processing services to a single site (i.e., one prison facility). Spadaro does not disclose the networking device for collecting or distributing VoIP data packets to a plurality of prison facilities with reference to embodiments of FIGS. 4 through 6B.

Finally, the “Edge Routing” described in Spadaro relates to sharing local access circuits for transmitting local calls via a Local Exchange Carrier (LEC). The paragraph relevant to “Edge Routing” reads as follows:

Mixed modes providing **both Local access wire circuits** (analog or digital) and **VoIP** may be used. **The local access circuits transport local calls at fixed lower rates to a Local Exchange Carrier (LEC), while the VoIP portion transports higher cost long distance calls to an Inter-Exchange Carrier (IXC).** By connecting a plurality of sites on the WAN, multiple sites could share a common set of local access circuits. The sharing of local access circuits is called ‘Edge Routing’. The Edge Routing negates the need for local access circuits at each facility. (Emphasis added). Spadaro, col. 4, ll. 56-65.

The above paragraph of Spadaro describes mixed modes that provide two separate modes: (i) local access wire circuit, and (ii) VoIP. The ‘Edge Routing’ in Spadaro is applicable only to the local access wire circuit and not to VoIP. In ‘Edge Routing,’ the local access circuits are shared by multiple sites and thereby obviate the need for such circuits at each facility. However, Spadaro does not describe or teach that the same sharing can be

applied to the VoIP portion. The local access wire circuitry and VoIP portion are distinct modes operating under different principles; and therefore, the disclosure or teaching associated with the local access wire circuitry is not applicable to the VoIP portion.

Based on at least the above reasons, Spadaro fails to disclose any networking device for collecting outgoing VoIP data packets from a plurality of prison facilities or distributing incoming VoIP packets to the plurality of prison facilities. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Spadaro.

Similar arguments are applicable to claim 59. Nowhere in Spadaro does it disclose the feature of “a call processing system at a location collecting outgoing Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) data packets. . . the call processing system processing the outgoing VoIP data packets . . . the call processing system processing incoming call signals. . . the call processing system detecting unauthorized three-way call activity. . . and the call processing system distributing the incoming VoIP data packets to the plurality of prison facilities via the digital data links,” as recited in claim 59.

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 59 are patentably distinguishable over Spadaro. Therefore, this rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: May 3, 2010

/Dohyun Ahn/
Dohyun Ahn, Reg. No. 63,237
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7291
Fax: (650) 938-5200